DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 034 497 HE 001 248

AUTHOR Brewster, Kingman, Jr.
TITLE The Report of the President. Yale University: 1967-68.
INSTITUTION Yale Univ., New Haven, Conn.
PUB DATE Sep 68
NOTE 39p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.05
DESCRIPTORS City Problems, Educational Objectives, *Governance, Group Relations, *Higher Education, *Institutional Role, School Community Relationship, *Social Responsibility, *University Administration
IDENTIFIERS *Yale University

ABSTRACT

The governance of Yale University and the relationship of this institution to urban problems in New Haven are discussed within the framework of what the distinctive nature and central mission of a university should be. The first section of the report analyzes the roles of Yale University's faculty members, administrators, and students in its governmental structure, and presents five basic recommendations for increased participation by students and faculty and mutual respect among the three groups. The second section discusses the current commitment of Yale University to the solution of pressing social problems in New Haven in the areas of neighborhood development, health, social work, tutoring, legal assistance, and employment. Four ways are suggested in which the university could increase its contributions to the attack on the city's social and educational problems without diverting its resources or distracting its members from their primary goals. (WM)

ED034497

Yale University: 1967-68

The Report of the President

HE 001 342

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED034497

Contents

I. HOW YALE SHOULD BE GOVERNED 3
The Faculty 3
The Administration 6
The Trustees 12
The Students 16
Guidelines for Yale's Governance 24

II. YALE'S ROLE IN SOLVING SOCIAL PROBLEMS 27
New Pressures for Action 27
Usefulness to New Haven 30
Four Possibilities 32

III. CONCLUSION 37

Two areas of University life have become matters of topical public concern as a result of dramatic incidents on other campuses. Even though Yale has thus far been spared the ugliness which elsewhere dramatized the issues, your President and Fellows have not been unmindful of: 1) the need to reassess the rationale and apparatus of the University's government; and 2) the need to think through and redefine what the University should and should not try to do in relation to the ills and problems of society, especially those of its own urban neighborhood.

While we have not been inactive on either of these matters, our policy and our thinking have tended to reveal themselves only in unconnected episodes or actions. Basic assumptions have seldom been reappraised; and have not recently been articulated. This Report seems an appropriate occasion to give a more rounded view of how we look upon both Yale's governance and Yale's relationship to the outside world.

THE CARL PURINGTON ROLLINS PRINTING-OFFICE
of THE YALE UNIVERSITY PRESS

I HOW YALE SHOULD BE GOVERNED

A lawyer might begin his analysis of the governance of a university with the be-all and end-all of legal authority: the charter and the legal powers of the trustees. In Yale's case this would be the President and Fellows of the Yale Corporation.

The Faculty

I would start, rather, with the faculty. This is because the quality of the faculty, from generation to generation, has more to do with the quality of the university than does any other single factor. The major effort of a university must be devoted to attracting, retaining, and making productive and effective the best scholarly teachers who are genuinely interested in the education of the oncoming generation. This has always been true. This fact is underscored in those institutions and fields where first rate faculty are scarce and first rate students are abundant. Even where there is not this contrast between the supply and demand of students and the supply and demand of faculty, in the course of time the best students will naturally tend to go where they expect to find the most stimulating and creative faculty.

The ability of a university to attract and keep a faculty of first quality does not depend upon the details of its governance. Among institutions of equal sensitivity to

faculty needs, the most important factor in an individual's decision is his assessment of the company he will find where he works; the stimulus he can expect from colleagues and students. This is especially true of his own field, but also true of the university at large. Facilities for work and the circumstances of family life as well as financial rewards will also make a difference.

All of these circumstances—professional, financial, domestic—could be superb, however, and yet a faculty would become quickly seduced by offers to go elsewhere if they could not count on a very great degree of self-determination.

As I pointed out in 1964 when I received the symbols of my office:

> ". . . there is a common ethic which draws some men to a university in preference to any of the many other groups which are now publicly as well as privately organized to discover as well as to apply knowledge. Affluence often, prestige sometimes, is foregone in order to be able to spend one's time and energy and mind upon whatever seems to him most intriguing and exciting; not to be directed by what some client or customer may request, or by what some absentee bureaucrat is willing to support."

One aspect of this individual self-determination is "academic freedom." In its narrowest, classic terms this means freedom from interference in your teaching and research, and what you write or say about it. More broadly it also means the chance to live and work in an atmosphere of uninhibited questioning and uncensored personal expression by all members of the community on all topics. Whether in personal, political, or professional discourse the faculty assumes its community will rely on the faith

so simply expressed by my predecessor, Whitney Griswold, that "The only sure weapon against bad ideas is better ideas."

The unique and sometimes trying institution of lifetime appointments for those who are invited to stay on after less than ten years of service—"tenure," so called—is an important practical as well as symbolic reassurance of the broad license for self-determination.

But the willingness of a faculty member to cast his career lot with a particular institution also depends on two other expectations. The first is the confidence that the nature of the institution and what it expects of him will not change radically or frequently without notice. He wants to know that his university is not likely suddenly to change its purposes and priorities. He counts on a reasonable continuity of the basic expectations upon which he staked his lifetime hopes for making a significant contribution to his field through his teaching and writing.

The second, which reinforces the first, is the faculty's assumption that decisions about the composition of the faculty and the standards for the degrees it recommends will be determined collectively by the faculty itself, not imposed by administrative fiat or adulterated by any pressure from alumni, students, or others.

At Yale the tradition of faculty self-government on all academic matters is long and deep and occasionally wearisome. As some wag put it: "There must be as many committees as there are faculty members, plus one." In the last five years no less than 95 full time tenured members of the faculties of Yale College and the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences have served for a year or more on one of the four committees on permanent appointments.

Three hundred and fifteen others have served during the same period either as department chairmen, directors of graduate or undergraduate studies in their department, or as members of a committee of the faculty of either Yale College or the Graduate School.

These facts and figures are concrete evidence of the very general proposition which I mentioned in my second Annual Report in 1965:

> ". . . we have been a very republican university. It has been our forte to draw upon the resources and imagination of the faculty for the direction as well as the operation of Yale."

The problem, of course, is one of finding the proper equilibrium between the faculty's desire to be left free to do its own individual work and the tremendous importance of being sure that in fact as well as feeling the academic program and environment of Yale is first and foremost up to the faculty itself.

For the purposes of this discussion it is sufficient to emphasize that the governance of this University must reflect scrupulous concern for each faculty member's individual self-determination of his own work and unqualified respect for the faculty's coliective self-determination of appointments to its ranks and the specification of academic requirements.

The Administration

The Administration must respond in equal measure to two contradictory instincts on the part of both faculty and students. One instinct is the desire not to be burdened with

managerial obligations. This applies to the provision of the wherewithal to make academic life possible: building construction, equipment, services, maintenance, the handling of and accounting for funds, the nonacademic staff and payroll.

The faculty has an enormous stake in the competence of such management. Every dollar wasted might have been spent on academic improvement. Every delayed or misplaced purchase or job order is a frustration to the academic "customer." Every clerical or accounting, library or laboratory service poorly performed makes the academic activity that much less effective.

Occasionally an energetic conscience will move an alert faculty or student group to needle an administrator on issues of principle like compensatory employment opportunities for the poor or racially disadvantaged. They did this most constructively just a year ago. But day in and day out, the student and faculty role in nonacademic management is one of complaining victim or appreciative beneficiary. They are rarely moved to seek to participate in nonacademic management.

The other instinct, the instinct for self-determination, obviously sets severe limits on administrative dictate. Since this instinct is buttressed by the security of lifetime faculty appointments, the university president bears little resemblance to his counterparts in business or government. He might better be compared to the head of an imaginary cabinet government who must try to secure a coherent legislative program from a parliament whose members know no party discipline and who have been elected for life. On academic matters persuasion is the only real instrument of administrative leadership. And persuasion

should be sufficiently seasoned with patience so that no new academic directions are undertaken until they have become quite genuinely the will of the faculty itself.

The recent authorization of experimental courses in the residential colleges would never have found approval in Yale College without the recommendation of a committee of well respected faculty members after a year of study. The endorsement, without dissent, by the Graduate School faculty of a new Institute of Social Sciences would not have been thinkable except for the thorough and painstaking preparation of the proposal by a diverse and distinguished group of faculty members drawn from the social science departments and the Law School. The fact that they were foreshadowed by earlier presidential Reports with the backing of the Yale Corporation may have stimulated the appointment of these committees; but the decision and the design depended entirely upon their development by members of the faculties concerned.

Administration, however, does have two significant levers. One is intangible, the other very tangible. The first is the simple fact that a dean's office is likely to offer an overview which comprehends the hopes and fears of a faculty as a collegiate entity; and the President and other officers of the University are expected to have a perspective and acquaintance which encompasses the University as a whole. This means that members of the University community as well as the outside world will presumably give more weight to strategic views of deans and officers than they would to those of any single individual or group within the faculty. Since major changes in direction and policy will require moving and adjusting many parts of the institution, voices of deans, officers, and the President are

bound to have special weight when it comes to the ways and means of achieving an objective.

The tangible leverage of administration derives from the inevitable fact that the execution of any policy depends greatly upon the rationing of scarce resources. The budget is the fulcrum on which the rise and fall of academic activities will turn. No one below the Provost and Treasurer at Yale can fairly make the ultimate comparative judgments upon which the rationing of Yale's resources depends.

Since resources are always far short of what ideally would allow Yale to do its best—we always have an "educational deficit"—there is special responsibility lodged in the President and his senior administrative colleagues to seek to secure additional resources. Solicitation, negotiation, and final specification of the purposes of new capital gifts inevitably involve communication of priorities which seek to match the needs of Yale with the interests of individual and institutional donors. While the faculty, through its committees and deans, must fashion both the prospectus and the design of programs which seek support, the President's commitment is bound to have much to do with the success of the effort.

In my first year a foundation executive asked me "I see all your many needs, but what do you want most?" I brashly replied: "We want most whatever you will give us twice as much for." While I would not repudiate that notion, even now, I am quite aware that even the most enthusiastically generous individual donors, and even the most responsibly helpful foundations, do want a sense of where the institution is heading, and what its major thrust for development is likely to be.

When financing of the work of the current faculty or the execution of existing programs is at stake, then donors will simply want to know that the administration will continue to give its support. It is the quality of the faculty which they are really relying upon. When a new program or development is involved, however, the donor will often take the message as authoritative only if it comes from the President's office.

The experimental five year B.A. program which permits a small number of selected students to spend a year between sophomore and junior years in a contrasting culture is a case in point. The Carnegie Corporation, which funded the program, was eager to know whether this was a genuine enthusiasm of the new administration, or simply a short run interest, and whether its demonstration effect was likely to be related to the basic educational philosophy of the President. This concern about administration commitment was even more markedly true in the case of capital fund raising for the new Engineering and Applied Science building, since there had been some doubt among alumni and foundations about the extent of the previous administration's commitment to Applied Science. The same questions arise currently in connection with the effort to find support for the development of a new institution for social and policy studies, for research and education organized around problems of urban life and education, and domestic and international problems of business and public policy.

Two conclusions emerge for the successful governance of the University. One is that Yale must permit its managers to manage, without undue delay or dissipation of decisiveness in providing the funds, facilities, and services essential to the academic enterprise.

The second is that even in matters of policy and direction of the University as an educational and scholarly institution, ultimately the rationing decisions have to be made by some person or relatively small group. They must have a perspective and a responsibility which comprehends the entire scope of Yale's activities. At some point a decisive judgment must be made after weighing competing claims for scarce resources. The only alternative would be a static formula which squeezed out all judgment, or an endless scramble whose disorder would permit no reliable consistent strategy of programs and appointments. Finally, the Presidential office must have sufficient discretion to enable its incumbent to be a convincing spokesman in dealing with the sources of capital support which are indispensable if Yale is to be both excellent and solvent.

The problem, of course, is again one of equilibrium. The harassed administrator's instinct is to believe that all consultation is a drag on decisive action. In fact, failure to take account of the ideas and feelings of those affected by a policy decision courts a far greater disaster. Alert and energetic protest by students outraged by the intrusion of skylights onto the Cross Campus is a timely illustration of the administration's failure to anticipate the value of broader community consultation before pushing a decision close to the point of no return.

If the administrator must curb his instinct for going it alone, however, so too the "victims" of decision have to take into account that administration must not be stultified in its effort to be decisive and convincing to those with whom it must deal in terms of contract or capital grant. In the selection of an architect or the ultimate approval of a design, for example, executive abdication of the ul-

timate responsibility for judgment on matters of taste and function would be disastrous. No architect worth his salt would accept the vox populi as his client.

The Trustees

Administration of a university cannot be considered without relation to the role of the trustees. At Yale this relationship has a distinctive intimacy because the President is not only a member of the board; he is their presiding member. There is no "chairman of the board." The Corporation is "the President and Fellows."

But the President's relation to his colleague trustees is quite different from his relationship to his colleague administrative officers. I share with my administrative colleagues the job of making operational decisions and the shaping of innovations designed to strengthen and improve the University. I do not expect my colleague trustees to administer or initiate policy but to oversee administration in four respects, once they have exercised their responsibility for the selection of the President:

First, to make sure that Yale is a respected, reliable, and responsible institution in its contractual, legal, and public relationships.

Second, to monitor administrative and faculty actions and scrutinize their recommendations to satisfy themselves that we are in fact abiding by the procedures and ground rules which we have declared or subscribed to. In short, trustees are responsible for seeing to it that the integrity of

the academic process is preserved against fiat, fecklessness, and favoritism.

Third, to see to it that what we do is within our means, and that it is done competently enough so that Yale's substance is not squandered.

Fourth, to be sure that what we undertake is consistent with the "original understanding" of Yale's purposes and mission as it has evolved over almost three centuries.

The impact of the Corporation on Yale's quality and its direction in any of these four areas is often felt most in the preliminary discussion of the trustee's views. Like an appellate court, the significance of its authority is measured more by way of anticipation of its views than by the number of times it reverses the decisions brought to it. Moreover, even when the trustees are quite satisfied with the substance of administrative or faculty recommendation, the style of its official presentation, especially on issues affecting the public, may depend greatly on the judgments contributed by various trustees to the form of the final disposition and public explanation.

If there is a single word to characterize the trustees' special responsibility it is concern for *continuity* while encouraging change to meet new demands. Though mortal themselves, their trust is not. The essence of their financial responsibility, for example, is to see to it that the claims of the present are met as fully as possible without prejudice to the ability of their successors to meet the University's needs in the time of future generations. This responsibility has recently moved Yale's trustees to stimulate and guide a major overhaul in Yale's budget and investment policies and procedures.

The responsibility for continuity does not end, how-

ever, with the concern for fiscal and financial prudence. It is the moral as well as legal obligation of trusteeship to assure itself that the purposes for which funds were given are respected. This not only means the scrupulous adherence to the terms of restricted gifts, it means also and perhaps more fundamentally insistence that Yale's general institutional purpose and mission shall remain faithful to the general expectations which her supporters reasonably entertained when they shared their substance with her. Here morality is compounded by institutional self interest, for, if her trustees were not faithful to this concern, Yale could not long expect others to entrust her with their capital in perpetuity. Also the society at large looks to the trustees for assurance that the institution is holding fast to the purposes which justify its privileges and immunities; especially freedom from interference, and freedom from taxation.

But reliable continuity in the University's purposes and standards has a significance for the substantive quality of Yale as an educational institution as well as for its ability to attract endowment and enjoy public favor. As I mentioned in the first section of this Report, a scholarly faculty counts heavily on the reliability of the terms and conditions of their work, on relative freedom from radical zigs and zags in the direction of University affairs. The trustees are the faculty's best assurance that neither outside pressure nor inside pretenders will be able to usurp the authority to govern the place and set it off on directions unexpected and unwanted by the faculty.

The Corporation's responsibility for maintaining not only the integrity of the academic process which accords the faculty a dominant voice, but a responsibility for a

continuity which outlasts any passing administrator, group, generation is supremely important to the quality of Yale over the generations. The device of lodging trusteeship in a board whose majority are selected by their predecessors seems to me the best, perhaps the only way to make the promise of continuity sufficiently convincing so that Yale can continue to attract both the faculty and the capital it needs in order to be outstanding. Although such a scheme of selection may seem to encourage a conservative homogeneity, in fact it probably produces more variety of age and viewpoint than an entirely elective process would. Notoriety is not crucial to selection.

Yale has been and is now extremely fortunate in the quality and dedication of its trustees. Whether drawn from politics and government (five); business, finance or corporate law (seven); or from the worlds of education, libraries, religion or science (four); no member of the Yale Corporation would think of himself as a "representative" of a constituency of age, class, area, or interest group. Although their views, professional competence, and ages are diverse, their common bond is that they are not expected to serve or represent any interest other than their own best judgment about how to discharge their trust. That trust, although private, is a trusteeship of the public interest in Yale's ability to conserve, advance, and transmit learning, not just from year to year, but more importantly from generation to generation, from century to century.

The equilibrium which must be sought is the classic one between the competing claims of continuity and of change. A trustee who either clings in panic to the past or who views all tradition with aggressive hostility would not well serve a university in our time. Yale's greatest strength at

the moment lies in the fact that it has a group of trustees who genuinely welcome change, provided it is designed best to fulfill Yale's ancient purposes in rapidly changing circumstances. Not only the financial and fiscal revamping previously referred to, but the undertaking of the Vassar study and the approval of a host of major changes in the academic regime of Yale College, and the enthusiastic authorization of the new institution for social and policy studies testify to the capacity of the Yale Corporation to encourage as well as welcome major reappraisals.

Perhaps most important is the continuous effort to devise ways in which the trustees may gain a more intimate awareness of the variety of faculty and student hopes and fears, enthusiasms and concerns. This seems to me the best way to assure that the trustees will not be unmindful of the community for which they hold ultimate legal responsibility, but to which, most fortunately, they have delegated a very large measure of self government.

The Students

Most students' principal reason for coming to a university is the hope to learn something. Some may be excessively concerned to get credit for learning something. Some few are here because and only because it is expected of them. They were pushed, dragged, or drifting. Hopefully an alert admissions apparatus keeps this quotient to a minimum. An increasing majority are professionally motivated. The traditional professional motivation has its eye on

a series of flagstones: general education as a stepping stone to professional education, professional or graduate education as a foundation for a fairly well defined career. The broader view of professional motivation has more in it of self discovery, of probing, than of stepping stone on a well marked out path. It is "inner directed" in the sense of search within for a creative impulse or capacity in art or science.

In greater numbers than ever before, I believe, students sense the sorrow of society and hope to find some way to make it happier by public or private leadership. Sometimes they are the kind of liberals whom the conservative might call radical, or the kind of conservatives whom the liberal might call reactionary. In any event no ideology has a monopoly on their kind. Their only common factor is their disgust with things as they are, and a fierce determination to find some better way, and follow it.

But whatever the particular student's motivation, the common hope is to find at Yale some help along the way to self development. Academic development is the largest part of it. But it is only a part. Intellectual development is not limited to the curriculum. It finds stimulus in the bull session, the group with a cause, and in a host of other organized and semi-organized extracurricular pursuits. And not all development is intellectual, let alone academic. The student is above all a living person, who thinks but also feels; who needs activities, ways of growth, and forms of expression that could not possibly all be provided even by the best curriculum. During his years as a student, his capacities for feeling, for living in concert with others, and for understanding the private and unrevealed self—these capacities also develop.

Also, although a happy disenchantment with preachy pietism typifies most of the young, there is a deep concern for the discovery and development of satisfying life purposes and standards. Moral development is still a crucial part of the university experience, or indeed of the experience of anyone in his late teens and early twenties.

The quality of the faculty, the quality of the extracurricular life, the quality of Yale as a residential community—all will determine how well the university years do in fact develop intellectual, personal, and moral talents to the limit of their potential.

There are two additional stimuli to this self development, in addition to the resources for learning and for living. One is the chance to make choices; the other is the chance to participate as a temporary partner in the enterprise.

As to student responsibility for choice, Yale has made tremendous strides in the last six or seven years. President Griswold's last important contribution to the structure and policies of Yale College was his appointment in 1961 of a Committee on the Freshman Year, and his enthusiastic implementation of their Report in 1962. Its spirit was the welcome recognition of the student as a responsible individual, whose decisions were worthy of respect. Since then this spirit has been carried further by four major changes in the academic environment of Yale College: 1) the abolition of the rigid prescriptions of the distribution requirement in favor of a much more flexible counseling system under which students are now free to choose their own course of study in the light of general faculty "guidelines"; 2) the abolition of a numerical marking system in favor of an honors, high pass, pass,

and fail system of grades; 3) the abolition of the requirement of five full year courses in favor of the student's option to cut back his course load by the equivalent of two full year courses when it best suits him during his four years; and 4) the grant of authority to the residential colleges to design experimental courses of a nondepartmental nature in response to student and faculty interest and initiative.

All of these reforms were championed by student spokesmen, in the *Yale Daily News* and on the Student Advisory Board. Many of them were initiated by the faculty well before any student prodding. All of them were ultimately recommended by overwhelming faculty votes. All of them were enthusiastically welcomed and approved by the Administration and the President and Fellows of the Yale Corporation.

Many of them would probably not have been pushed as fast without active student support. None of them would have been adopted with the voluntary commitment essential to their success if they had been rammed down the throat of the faculty either by the coercion of administrative fiat or by the coercion of student threats.

In addition to the chance to make choices which has now been built into the academic life of Yale College to a degree rarely matched elsewhere, there is at Yale as there is in other institutions, a strong desire by many students to play a meaningful part in the design and direction of the University. This is not new to Yale. One cannot browse in Yale memorabilia without feeling the deep and widespread sense of responsibility for the institution which pervades the Yale College tradition. Honorary and Senior Society life, for all its anachronisms, has often evidenced,

over the generations, an active, constructive concern for Yale's quality.

In retrospect I now count Yale extremely fortunate to have been awakened to the vital concern of the current generation of students for the quality of their Yale education by the well publicized case of a popular philosophy teacher who was not promoted to tenure in 1965. Not just exhibitionists, agitators, and *News* pundits, but scores of academic and extracurricular achievers and swarms of average undergraduates poured out their concern for the standards and procedures for faculty appointment and promotion. The disposition of the particular case was not the most important aspect. Even the very salutary "Dahl Report" which reappraised appointment standards and procedures was not the most significant outcome. The most crucial impact was the message to the entire Yale community, especially to the faculty, that we were henceforth in a new era in which students demanded and deserved respect for their views about how to improve Yale education.

The faculty rejected the particular form of student evaluation of teaching which was proposed by the Administration and the Executive Committee of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. They were under a burden, however, to come up with a better plan. So they did. As a result, for two years now there has been a series of committees, department by department as well as college-wide, which have engaged faculty and students together in appraisal of the quality of curricula, courses, and instruction. Last spring it was proposed that the parallel faculty and student committees on teaching for Yale College as a whole should be merged into a single joint committee, with equal votes for

all student and faculty members. In addition it was urged that a way be found for the Yale College Course of Study Committee to include voting student membership.*

This recital is not made out of a spirit of self-congratulation. It is, rather, to acknowledge that Yale would not have made as much constructive progress, would not have capitalized on the new student interest in educational policy long before the current outbursts, had it not been for student initiative triggered by the appointments case three years ago.

There are for students, as there are for the faculty, competing interests and practical considerations which bear on their participation in university direction. On the one hand the typical student does not want to be saddled with the burdens of time and energy and attention which active participation in the management of the University would entail. On the other, his career is more dependent than ever on the quality of the education he receives, so naturally he wants to have the right to have a say in the things which affect him vitally, even though he may not want to take the trouble to exercise that right between crises.

Practical considerations also enter into the question of how the views of students can best be represented. The chance for the administration and faculty to take into account the variety of student views will not always be

*The question of student representation on the Executive Committee of the College has also been proposed. This and other aspects of the way the University deals with student behaviour is the subject of a Faculty Committee Report submitted last year but whose consideration was postponed pending various changes in the organization of the Campus Police, the Dean's Office, and the Secretary's Office which relate to this area.

best served by relying upon a single "representative" group or individual. Different problems will stimulate different people to constructive contribution. There is no issue on which there is any such thing as a single "student viewpoint." Widespread involvement can be stultified, the views of average students can be misrepresented if all is made to turn on the voice of those who happen to want to devote full time to university policy.

Happily Yale is still small enough, still informal enough so that reliance on a "chosen instrument" for the expression of student views is not necessary. Officers and Deans are not inaccessible. Most important, the residential colleges complement the departmental structure and provide a channel of communication through the fellowship to the faculty and through Masters and Deans to the administration. No student with any initiative can claim in good faith that his voice cannot be heard. But, he asks, even though he is heard, is he listened to?

This is a matter of personal temperament, habit and style. Sometimes a trustee or administrator may be ahead of the faculty. Obviously some faculty members are more responsive than others. I can testify, however, from recent exposure to the educational traditions and attitudes of other countries that American faculties in general and the Yale faculty in particular are way ahead of the faculties of almost all other nations in their regard for student views. What is still needed, however, is a more widespread appreciation that all serious students will be better students and all teachers will be more effective teachers if student ideas are treated not only with tolerance and patience but with respect. Respect and attention to student ideas should

be a presumption until it is forfeited by the student's own unwillingness to deal with the problem seriously and rigorously.

Trustees as well as members of the administration have recently been exposed to concerned students in a rather remarkable way, again as a result of student initiative through the Student Advisory Board. On two occasions last year each member of the Corporation spent at least two hours in undirected discussion with students over the breakfast table in one of the residential colleges. Both times in all colleges the reaction by trustee, students, and the host Master alike was enthusiastic. In many cases the variety of student views elicited, the candor and intensity of discussion, were worth any number of formal presentations by petition or through avenues of symbolic student "representation." Accessibility of the President and other officers for candid off the record question and answer discussion is also an important way to keep administrators aware of the hopes and fears, satisfactions and frustrations, of all sectors of the University.

Ways must be found for more frequent but not necessarily more formal mutual inquiry by all levels of trusteeship, administration, faculty, and students, in all schools, in pursuit of Yale's improvement. Different groups may well respond to different problems. Widespread participation cannot be coerced, but it should be made possible in whatever way seems most conducive to serious attack on the particular problem at hand.

It is too bad that two perfectly good expressions have, by recent caricature, been turned into epithets. One is "consensus," the other is "participatory democracy."

"Consensus" now conjures up compromise at best, at worst compromise achieved by manipulation and arm-twisting.

"Participatory democracy" too often conjures up the disarray of leaderless discourse; of ends without means, or means without ends. At worst it evokes the spectre of a syndicalism wholly opposed to all order and authority.

Yet both consensus and widespread participation in community direction seem to me much more crucial to the success of the academic enterprise than does any legalistic allocation of powers or any political structure which assumes that the interests which make up a university are inherently adversary.

Guidelines for Yale's Governance

Yale's government can never be a closed rule book, or a constitution which defies amendment. It must be expected that new demands and new experience will evolve new relationships, amplify new voices, and dampen old ones. I would be disappointed if Yale this year were not to continue active discussion of ways of improving her governance.

There are several propositions, however, which seem to me fairly durable.

First, Yale should be able to count on most of its members, most of the time to share a belief in the University's central purpose as a place to advance learning and educate the oncoming generations in the arts and sciences and learned professions. The principal means to this end is a

broad responsibility for the exercise of individual choice and the untrammeled exercise of free inquiry and expression.

Because of the nature of our central purpose, one who prefers teaching detached from research and scholarship, or who prefers research without educational obligation will not long be happy here.

Because of the nature of our principal means, anyone who thinks that the institution should have a party line, either for indoctrination of students or to influence the direction of society in behalf of a single point of view, will also not be satisfied here.

Second, every person in the Yale Community has a right to expect that others are not using their role in the institution for goals which do not fulfill the central purposes of the university. While one is here, his views regarding the University should be primarily motivated by what is best for Yale, not what will help him attain some other personal, political, or ideological objective. Just as a trustee should not be taking his cue from any outside group, and an administrator should not be making his decisions in the light of any extra-mural ambition, so too, faculty and students deserve respect for their views on University matters only to the extent that they are primarily motivated by concern for the quality and integrity of the University.

Third, anyone who is himself willing to listen deserves to be listened to. If he is unwilling to open his own mind to persuasion, then he forfeits his claim on the audience of others.

Fourth, coercion must be rejected as a substitute for persuasion in the area of ideas, and violence must be rejected as a substitute for expression as a technique for in-

fluencing the actions of others. Neither willful abuse of authority nor willful disruption of the activity of the University can be tolerated. The right to petition for the removal of any officer who abuses his authority must always be open. The right to recommend the suspension or dismissal of anyone who disrupts the life of the University must also be understood.

Ultimately it is the sharing of purposes, however, not the allocation of rights and duties and powers, which keeps a university intact. Yale is a community of good will and of loyalty more than it is a regime of laws.

The area of "external" relations, including alumni consultation and participation (with which this Report does not seek to deal) has over the years posed some of the same questions, and has given similar answers. If mutual respect is maintained, if good faith can be counted on, then agreement on every policy issue is not the most important thing. What is supremely important is the widespread confidence that those who are entrusted with final decision have taken into account the ideas and feelings of those who care. Once decision has been made, for better or for worse, common purpose and common loyalty usually succeed in moving beyond disagreement to renewed support of the common enterprise.

II YALE'S ROLE IN SOLVING SOCIAL PROBLEMS

The University's special role as a sanctuary for self determined scholars, teachers, and students is directly challenged by society's desire to put the university to work in the solution of pressing social problems. This conflict in purposes has taken on new tension as public and private management has become increasingly unmanageable, the world order has become more disorderly, and urban life has become more unlivable. At the same time specialized knowledge and advanced education have become more and more useful operationally.

New Pressures for Action

The new pressure from business, from the federal government, from state and local communities is to have the university go beyond individual scholarly research, go beyond training of professional manpower to undertake an *institutional* commitment to work on unsolved social problems. When this takes the form of contracting with the Central Intelligence Agency or undertaking a proprietary sponsorship of the Institute of Defense Analysis then it is quickly criticized by some as a perversion of the academic ethic. The same critics, however, more often than not are most insistent that the University should sponsor their own causes, and undertake activities which reflect their own social priorities, particularly in the re-

structuring of urban life, the urban economy, and urban education.

Yale and every other university badly needs a theory, or at least a way of thinking about its function, which will tell itself and explain to others what the University should and should not try to do in the application of its tangible resources, its managerial apparatus, and its know-how to the solution of social problems.

On the one hand it is obvious that the social sciences are taking their place alongside medicine and law as resources for constructive human and social action. Practical problems can be just as intellectually rigorous, just as challenging to intellectual ingenuity as the solving of more theoretical puzzles or the search for a more abstract truth. Clinical teaching and research need not genuflect before the pure medical scientist. Action oriented legal scholarship and teaching can be at least as rigorous and stimulating as the model building of the "pure" social scientist.

On the other hand, there is still proper concern lest a university which is hospitable to work on practical problems should permit itself to become, as my predecessor feared, a "service station."

The teaching of applied subjects can slip into vocationalism. Research on the solving of problems can be subverted by excessive attention to problems because they are lucrative or topical, rather than because of their intrinsic intellectual importance.

James Perkins, the President of Cornell, sought to chart the middle course in his lectures at Princeton a couple of years ago. He drew the line between the proper job of the university to figure out ways of solving social problems and the improper university activity of trying to put these

solutions into operational effect. We are, in short, best equipped to be our brothers' thinker. We have no special competence to be our brothers' legislator or banker or diplomat or manager.

The issue was faced most recently by a special committee which I appointed two years ago to study the "operational uses of the Social Sciences." Their Report recommended the creation of an Institute of Social Science. (I would prefer to call it an Institution for Social and Policy Studies.) This proposal with slight modifications was endorsed by the faculty of the Graduate School. Just last June it was most enthusiastically approved by the President and Fellows of the Yale Corporation after it had been reviewed and applauded by a distinguished committee of the University Council under the Chairmanship of George B. Young, 1934, Ph.D. 1939.

Since the Report embodying this proposal is available to those who are interested, I need not recite its contents here. However, the gravamen of the exercise was to devise an institutional arrangement and procedure for appointment to its staff which would give Yale the best of both worlds. On the one hand it would permit clusters of teachers and students to work together on problems to whose solution many disciplines and professions might contribute—such as urban affairs, education and its administration, and the management of domestic and international organizations. At the same time it was important to assure that the staff would measure up to the standards of the various schools and departments normally responsible for the professions and disciplines concerned. By lodging the responsibility for the matter with a governing board drawn from the faculty of arts and sciences and the learned pro-

fessions, the Committee sought to assure that the new enterprise would not become either vocational or a service station subject to the direction of outside business or governmental interests.

Two of the proposed "centers" which would be constituent parts of the new institution for social and policy studies would bear directly upon Yale's relationship to its own New Haven neighborhood. A Center for Urban Studies and a Center for Educational Studies should attract experts and funds and facilities which would make Yale more useful to New Haven's social development. This would make it easier for Yale to make some contribution to the improvement of the City's wholly inadequate public school system.

The demand for Yale to be useful to the city is not met, however, by our presence as a source of trained talent and up to date data and ideas. To the traditional resentment of some taxpayers who begrudge Yale its property tax exemption is now added the resentment of those disadvantaged citizens well below the taxpaying level who have a misplaced hope that somehow Yale's financial and human resources could solve the problem of the urban poor, especially the Black and Puerto Rican urban poor.

Yale, of course, has an enormous stake in the health of its New Haven neighborhood. Also, both faculty and students are more actively concerned than ever before about

the wretchedness of the way of life, the education, and the economic opportunity of the majority of the Black community in New Haven. Finally, the Corporation is eager to see to it that Yale, in a manner consistent with its primary mission, does whatever it can in order to contribute some national leadership in the effort to solve the country's most pressing problem. Fortunately, there are individuals as well as foundations and government agencies eager to respond if we could come up with a really promising idea for constructive action to remedy the human blight in modern American cities.

These interests and these forces came together in an authorization by the Yale Corporation to the officers last Spring to study and experiment with ways in which Yale might contribute to neighborhood development, especially in the predominantly Black neighborhoods. A foundation which had already made a broad discretionary grant to the University approved the allocation of one hundred thousand dollars of its grant to permit a local group, called the Black Coalition, to undertake preliminary staffing and planning for both neighborhood development corporations and improved employment opportunities for the untrained. Simultaneously, I designated C. Tracy Barnes, 1933, to be my Special Assistant for Community Relations and Development. I also asked him to chair a Council of faculty and staff members who had some responsibility for one or another of the programs already under way in the disadvantaged areas of the City.

In addition to a very large Yale College student involvement in social work and tutoring, the Law School has pioneered in Legal Assistance; the Medical School has established neighborhood clinics in mental health and child

care; and the Divinity School has placed interns in neighborhoods and welfare groups.

Perhaps the most direct institutional impact on the disadvantaged is Yale's own employment policy. More aggressive recruitment among the hard core unemployed and opening up better chances for in-service promotion has been a special responsibility of a revamped personnel office. The Director of Personnel and his Associate Director for Employment Opportunity are also represented on Mr. Barnes' Council.

It is clear that we cannot turn away from the problems of New Haven in haughty academic aloofness. It is equally clear that what we do should not only be consistent with our primary mission as a center of learning, but should not dilute the quality of what we do in teaching and scholarship.

Perhaps most important, our role in the City must not subvert the neutrality of the University. It too must respect the diversity of interests and viewpoints which a free university must accommodate. Faculty and students must not be coerced into any party line, or represented as though they all agreed on political, social, or moral issues.

Four Possibilities

It seems to me there are basically four ways in which Yale could greatly increase its contribution to the attack on the problems of New Haven without diverting resources, without distracting its members from their primary mission.

The first is to make it easier for faculty, staff, and students to contribute their own time and talent and energy as volunteers, consultants, or even as salaried workers on city problems. Obviously this means greater flexibility in releasing time on a total or partial leave of absence basis. Additional resources may well have to be obtained to compensate the individuals concerned or to compensate Yale for the absence of a necessary teacher or employee. There is a great well of concern, a great pool of talent among the Yale community which ought to be more freely available for the benefit of its neighborhood. The individual's choice must not be coerced. Resources must not be diverted from educational purposes. If the time can be accommodated, however, this extension of Yale life into the community ought to be encouraged.

The second category of Yale potential for the community is related to the development of graduate research and education programs on problems of the city. The presence of an adequate faculty and staff and professionally motivated students would be a most important addition to the pool of voluntary or consultative talent. In addition, it is altogether likely that the clinical application of the social-scientific disciplines and related professions to urban affairs will in fact be best taught and best studied by using actual problems of city government, education, health, and welfare. The analogy to the clinical aspect of medical education and its reliance upon a teaching hospital is an imperfect analogy at best. Nevertheless operational problems in the city are bound to be an academic resource.

The appropriateness of a particular action problem for purposes of study and training must be determined by its intellectual and professional significance, not simply

by the usefulness of the service which would be rendered. No program of urban or educational studies could long maintain its standards if the choice of areas of work were guided by any other criterion. Within these limits, however, programs already envisaged within the new institution for social and policy studies as soon as they are funded and staffed should make a direct contribution to a more imaginative attack on some aspects of New Haven's problems. In the field of elementary and secondary education, especially, there is no doubt that we have been less of a resource for the city than we might have been because of the absence of a School or Department of Education at Yale. The projected Center for Educational Studies should go a long way to remedy this lack.

The two other ways in which Yale might be true to its primary mission and still make a significant contribution to the solution of urban problems involve the use of Yale's good offices. One is in obtaining outside support, primarily from government and foundations. The other is the related possibility of the use of Yale's sponsorship or trusteeship of civic organizations whose function may well not be academic.

Neighborhood groups or even quasi public institutions concerned with community development will often find it useful to seek Yale's endorsement of an application for public or foundation funds. This may be so even though Yale itself will play no part in the execution of the project. Sometimes this may be because there is among the faculty or administration someone or some group with special qualification as an expert witness. Sometimes it will be simply because Yale's freedom from motives of either profit or of political favor may make our testimony a

credible warranty for an application by a business or political entity. Sometimes, of course, part of a larger package for which support is sought by a community group will be a Yale project or a faculty member's research proposal. In such a case Yale would be a co-signer, more as a joint venturer than as neutral endorser.

Finally it may be that Yale's willingness to share the trusteeship of a civic enterprise will affect not only the interest of others to contribute capital, but would carry an assurance of permanence and political acceptability precisely because of our political neutrality. Also there may be managerial and prudential talent which members of the Yale administration or members of the Yale Corporation could provide without undue diversion from their more central Yale obligations. If we can contribute to the trusteeship and various levels of administrative oversight of Yale–New Haven Hospital, there is no reason, in theory, why we could not contribute to the directorship of a Yale–New Haven Development, Housing, or Education Corporation.

It will take much more thought and ingenuity and planning before we know precisely what we should attempt, and whether we can secure the financial backing and the professional manpower to do a good job. My effort here is limited to an attempt to sketch the considerations which must guide what we should and should not try to do.

With the encouragement and even prodding by members of the Corporation we have been working on some of these possibilities steadily since last Spring. In the field of elementary and secondary education Mr. Barnes' Council has had the valuable consultative assistance of Samuel Brownell, formerly Superintendent of the Detroit Schools, and of Arthur Singer, until recently President of the Education

Development Center of Cambridge, Massachusetts. In the area of employment and personnel policy we have not only attracted an able young staff but hope to have the benefit of consultative counsel of Levi Jackson, 1950, currently at a high level of responsibility for personnel policy in the Ford Motor Company.

As we obtain a better sense of what we can and cannot do we will naturally develop the design of specific programs in conjunction with the neighborhood, governmental, and private groups in the community which would be affected.

The stakes are high. There is no denying a certain institutional self interest of any urban university in the protection of its privileged existence from the threats inherent in urban decay.

But Yale's self interest in the health of the New Haven way of life, its economy, and its political stability is not just defensive and protective. Our ability to attract and keep the best faculty and staff and students is profoundly affected by the prosperity of New Haven, the quality of its education, and the attractiveness of the whole city environment.

More important than these obvious practical ways in which Yale's survival and Yale's drawing power depend upon solution to New Haven's urban ills, however, is the importance of Yale's concern, the vitality of its constructive activity, to the atmosphere of the entire University community. If we are callous, petty, or even timid in our effort to do something about our own neighborhood we cannot expect Yale to be what it should be as a place for the personal and moral as well as intellectual development of the oncoming generations.

We have a special opportunity and vulnerability because we are located in a city which is not of overwhelming size. Faculty, students, officers and trustees can more easily see the results of what Yale does, or feel the proper blame for what it fails to do than they might do either in a rural setting or in a giant metropolis.

If we can do more for Yale's urban environment without draining or distorting our efforts to educate the oncoming generations and advance understanding we shall have made a demonstration for America which will be useful far beyond our own city.

III CONCLUSION

In searching for a way of thinking about Yale's governance and Yale's relationship with the city I have urged that we keep constantly in mind the distinctive nature of a university. It is above all else a place to advance knowledge and to assist students to share in and help create that knowledge. By a tradition we share with all western universities worthy of the name, we are committed to pursuit of this goal by encouraging students and faculty alike to examine competing and conflicting views, and to bring their full talents to bear in making an objective and fearless choice among the alternatives of importance.

The pressures from within and without to deviate from this central mission make our success far from certain, never easy. It is the paradox of the university that it is en-

abled to pursue its distinctive purpose largely because the people who shape it directly or indirectly do agree on the definition of its central goal. They also agree upon the means for achieving it; even though they may, and usually do, disagree about almost everything else.

Yale must by the nature of its purpose permit its members, students and faculty alike, to espouse the ideas and causes of their choice. But Yale as an institution cannot let itself be "mobilized" for any cause, no matter how noble, or for the achievement of a social objective extraneous to its purpose, no matter how worthy.

Our service to the nation and to the world is still best rendered by preserving Yale as a "safe haven where ruthless examination of realities will not be distorted by the aim to please or by the risk of displeasure."

KINGMAN BREWSTER, JR.

September, 1968